To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations.

2

2.

3

4

5

7

6

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

26

25

27

28

Jurisdiction and Venue

3. The allegations in ¶ 3 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations.

The allegations in \P 2 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required.

- 4. The allegations in ¶ 4 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations.
- 5. The allegations in ¶ 5 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations.
- 6. Regarding the allegations in ¶ 6, Defendants deny that venue is proper and further deny that the transactions, acts, practices, and courses of business described in the Complaint occurred within the jurisdiction of the Eastern District of Texas.

Parties

- 7. The allegations in ¶ 7 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations.
- 8. Rizvi denies that he is 40 years old or that he resides at 2205 Simplicity Drive, Irvine, California.
- 9. Bellweather admits that its principal place of business was Irvine, California. Defendants further believe that Plaintiff unwittingly and in error misspelled Irvine as "Irving."
- 10. Strategy admits that its principal place of business was Newport Beach, California.

Statement of Facts

11. Rizvi admits that he completed law school and received a Masters of Law degree in Securities and Financial Regulation in 1993 from Georgetown University Law School. Rizvi further admits that he practiced law from 1993 to 2001. Except as otherwise admitted, Rizvi denies the allegations in \P 11.

6

8

11

10

13

12

15

14

17

16

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

26

25

27 28

12. Rizvi admits that he voluntarily surrendered his law license in 2001. Rizvi further admits that he entered a plea agreement resulting in several felony convictions. Except as otherwise admitted, Rizvi is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations in \P 12.

- 13. Defendants admit that Bellweather was once called Landmark Microcap Fund, Inc., Rhino Microcap Fund, Inc., and Tiger Fund, Inc., prior to being called Bellweather Venture Cap Fund, Inc. Rizvi admits that he operated as a management advisor to Bellweather through Strategy and further admits that he developed Bellweather to operate as a business development company and that Bellweather's operation were co-managed with a SEC Registered Investment Advisor. Bellweather admits that it has never been registered with the Commission as an investment company pursuant to Section 8 of the Investment Company Act nor has it filed a registration statement with the SEC under Section 12 of the Exchange Act.
- 14. Rizvi admits that he formed Strategy on or around June 2002 and has controlled the company since its inception. Except as otherwise admitted, Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in ¶ 14.
- 15. Defendants admit that a Bellweather Offering Circular was filed in compliance with Regulation E of the Securities Act of 1933. Except as otherwise admitted, the allegations in ¶ 15 are legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations.
- 16. Bellweather admits that it did not file a registration statement under Section 12 of the Exchange Act. Except as otherwise admitted, Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in ¶ 16.
- 17. Defendants admit that Bellweather raised approximately \$1,873,385 from at least 173 investors throughout the United States. Defendants deny that Strategy or Rizvi employed a team of sales persons. Except as otherwise admitted or denied, Defendants are without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the remaining allegations in ¶ 17.

Case 4	09-cv-003	71-MHS-AM Document 11 Filed 09/24/09 Page 4 of 10 PageID #: 37	
1	18.	Defendants deny the allegations in ¶ 18.	
2	The	e Misleading Statements and Misapplication of Offering Proceeds	
3	19.	Defendants deny the allegations in ¶ 19 and further deny that this case involves	
4	false or misleading statements.		
5	20.	Defendants deny the allegations in \P 20.	
6	21.	Defendants admit that they caused to be filed an offering circular referred to in ¶	
7	21, the statements contained therein speak for themselves. Defendants admit that the offering		
8	circular did not disclose Rizvi's criminal convictions.		
9	22.	Defendants deny the allegations in \P 22.	
10	23.	Defendants deny the allegations in \P 23.	
11	24.	Defendants admit that they caused to be filed an offering circular referred to in \P	
12	24, the statements therein speak for themselves. Except as otherwise admitted, Defendant deny		
13	the allegations in ¶ 24.		
14	25.	Defendants deny the allegations of \P 25.	
15	26.	Defendants deny the allegations of \P 26.	
16	27.	Defendants deny the allegations of \P 27.	
17		FIRST CLAIM	
18		Violations of Section 5(a) and 5(c) of the Securities Act	
19	28.	Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to $\P\P$ 1-27, $supra$, as though	
20	set forth fu	ally herein.	
21	29.	The allegations of \P 29 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required.	
22	To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to		
23	them.		
24	30.	The allegations of ¶ 30 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required.	
25	To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to		
26	them.		
27			
28		4	
		-4-	

8

6

9 10

12

13

11

14

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

31. The allegations of ¶ 31 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to them.

SECOND CLAIM

Violations of Section 17(a) of the Securities Act

- 32. Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to $\P 1 - 27$, supra, as though set forth fully herein.
- 33. The allegations in ¶ 33 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to them.
- 34. The allegations in ¶ 34 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to them.
- 35. The allegations in ¶ 35 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to them.
- 36. The allegations in ¶ 36 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to them.
- Defendants incorporate by reference their responses to ¶¶ 1-27, *supra*, as though 37. set forth fully herein.
- 38. The allegations in ¶ 38 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to them.
- 39. The allegations in ¶ 39 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to them.

Case 4	09-cv-00371-MHS-AM Document 11 Filed 09/24/09 Page 7 of 10 PageID #: 40			
1	48. The allegations in ¶ 48 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required.			
2	To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to			
3	them.			
4	49. The allegations in ¶ 49 state a legal conclusion to which no response is required.			
5	To the extent a response is deemed necessary, Defendants deny the allegations as they apply to			
6	them.			
7	AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES			
8	Defendant alleges the following affirmative defenses to the allegations set forth in the			
9	Complaint.			
10	First Affirmative Defense			
11	(Improper Venue)			
12	Venue in this case is improper because none of the acts alleged in this Complaint took			
13	place in the Eastern District of Texas. The Complaint alleges that Defendants were all			
14	headquartered in Southern California. Of the 173 investors stated in ¶ 1 of the Complaint, ar			
15	overwhelming majority are located in California. Hence nearly all the witnesses anticipated in			
16	this matter are located in California.			
17	Second Affirmative Defense			
18	(Failure to State a Claim)			
19	The Complaint, and each of the purported claims against Defendants, fails to state a claim			
20	upon which relief can be granted.			
21	Third Affirmative Defense			
22	(Lack of Materiality)			
23	None of the conduct alleged in the Complaint was material to the investment decisions of			
24	reasonable investors.			
25	Fourth Affirmative Defense			
26	(Reliance on SEC Examining Attorneys)			
27	Defendants are not liable for Plaintiff's claims because he relied in good faith upon the			
28	professional judgments of Plaintiff's examining attorneys at the time of the alleged acts as to -7-			
	ANSWER TO COMPLAINT			

Case 4	09-cv-00371-MHS-AM Document 11 Filed 09/24/09 Page 8 of 10 PageID #: 41			
1	matters which they reasonably believed to be within such persons' professional or expert			
2	competence.			
3	Fifth Affirmative Defense			
4	(Good Faith)			
5	Defendants at all times acted in good faith and with good cause.			
6	Sixth Affirmative Defense			
7	(Reliance on Legal Professionals)			
8	Defendants are not liable for Plaintiff's claims because they relied in good faith upon the			
9	professional judgments of their legal professionals at the time of the alleged acts as to matter			
10	which he reasonably believed to be within such persons' professional or expert competence.			
11	Seventh Affirmative Defense			
12	(Statute of Limitations)			
13	The claims alleged in the Complaint are barred, in whole or in part, by the applicable			
14	statutes of limitation.			
15	Eighth Affirmative Defense			
16	(Injunctive Relief Not Warranted)			
17	Plaintiff's claims for injunctive relief are barred because there has been no violation of			
18	the Securities Act or the Exchange Act, and because there is no reasonable likelihood that any			
19	violation will be repeated. Plaintiff's injunctive relief claim is further barred because the adverse			
20	effects of an injunction far outweigh any benefit from an injunction.			
21	<u>Tenth Affirmative Defense</u>			
22	(Penalties Not Warranted)			
23	Plaintiff's claim for penalties is barred because any alleged violation was isolated and/or			
24	unintentional.			
25				
26				
27				
28	-8-			
	ANSWER TO COMPLAINT			

///

28